REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 1-4, 14-15, 28-30, and 37-38. The amendments are made to improve the clarity of the claims. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-15 and 28-38 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-14 and 28-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Le, et al. (US 6,556,820 hereinafter Le). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

In paragraph 3 of the Detailed action, a serving GPRS support node (SGSN) appears to be equated with a Gateway Location Register. The functions of the GLR are different than that of the SGSN. In effect the GLR is an intermediate node between the HLR and VLRs and presents a HLR interface to the VLR and a VLR interface to the HLR. The GLR is used to reduce internetwork signaling. In GSM terms, the GLR can be described as a VLR for all subscribers roaming from other networks. and only one GLR is needed for each network (para 4). The SGSN, on the other hand, is a separate node with different functions and may be supported, indirectly, by the GLR (see 3G TS 29.119 V3.0.0 (2000-03) "Technical Specification 3rd Generation Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group Core Network; GPRS Tunnelling Protocol (GTP) specification for GLR (Release 1999).

The Applicant's invention discloses a method and system for indicating support for features available to a mobile subscriber in a network by notifying an HLR of the features not supported. The invention reduces the level of internetwork signaling.

Normally, when a mobile subscriber roams into a network other than the mobile's home network, the VLR contacts the subscriber's HLR to determine the features to which the subscriber is subscribed. Also, the VLR normally sends a listing of the features that the MSC/VLR can provide to the subscriber while in the network. The

Applicant's invention reduces the internetwork signaling by having the VLR communicate with the Gateway Location Register, which in turn passes the communication to the subscriber's HLR. The GLR services multiple VLRs associated with the visited network and as the mobile roams the visited network, each VLR that associates with the mobile communicates feature availability to the GLR. In the Applicant's invention, the GLR passes the information to the HLR in the form of features not available to the mobile. This action and the use of the GLR as an intermediate point between the VLRs and the mobile's HLR reduce the amount of signaling. Since there are specific services that may be available through the visited VLRs, the listing of non-supported features implicitly indicates to the HLR the supported features. This step reduces the size of the messages and the number of messages since the HLR communicates with the GLR rather than multiple VLRs in the visited network.

The Le reference appears to disclose a method and system for managing terminals with multiple subscriptions. In the Le reference "[T]he signaling load is kept low by (1) defining common signaling procedures which need not be repeated for each subscription, and (2) using compact bit string coding to identity the subscriptions within the procedures." (Column 4, lines 59-63). Le uses signaling procedures and reduced coding to identify subscriptions for the terminal to keep the signaling low. In contrast to the Applicant's invention, the Le reference transmits a list of the VLR supported subscriptions (features) rather than the non-supported subscriptions. The signaling still takes place between VLRs in the visited network and the HLR of the terminal according to the Le reference.

Since Le does not disclose use of a GLR or a function emulating the GLR the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of these claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 15 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Le et al. (US 6,556,820 B1 hereinafter Le) in view of Rune (US 6,212,390 B1 hereinafter Rune). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

Page 9 of 11

The Rune reference is cited for calculating and defining a restricted area which is used for mobility management. However, the Applicant respectfully submits that Rune does not disclose the limitation missing from Le, that of the use of a Gateway Location Register for communication between a network's VLRs and the mobile subscriber's HLR. Additionally, the cited prior art does not disclose sending non-supported features to the HLR from the GLR. The Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of these claims.

PAGE 13/14

Prior Art Not Relied Upon

In paragraph 6 on page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By Sidney L. Weatherford Registration No. 45,602

Date: May 23, 2005

Ericsson Inc. 6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11 Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656 sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com